

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Advisory Action dated August 28, 2007 and the Final Office Action dated May 9, 2007 have been received and their contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 1 is hereby amended. Claims 2, 4, 10 and 11 are herein cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 12-16 are currently pending, with claims 5-9 and 12-16 being withdrawn from consideration. Upon indication of allowability of claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of claims 5-9, as they depend from claim 1. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because the limitation “diphenylphosphino” allegedly has insufficient antecedent basis in the claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration. Without admitting to the propriety of the rejection and in order to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the claim language of claim 4. Also, claims 4 and 11 are herein cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is overcome and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-4 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Krocher et al., Journal of Catalysis, 1998, 178, p. 284-298 (hereinafter “Krocher”). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over Krocher in that the claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, “compound represented by the general formula is selected from the group consisting of: 1-diethylphosphino-2-triethoxysilylthane, 1-dimethylphosphino-2-trimethoxysilylthane, 1-diethylphosphino-2trimethoxysilylthane, 1-diphenylphosphino-2-trimethoxysilylthane, 1-dimethylphosphino-3triethoxysilylpropane, 1-diethylphosphino-3-triethoxysilylpropane, 1-diphenylphosphino-3-triethoxysilylpropane, 1-diphenylphosphino-3-triethoxysilylpropane, 1-diphenylphosphino-2-trichlorosilylthane, 1-diphenylphosphino-2trisdimethylaminosilylthane, 1-diphenylphosphino-2-triisocyanatosilylthane and 1-diphenylphosphino-4-triethoxysilylethylbenzene, wherein the material prevents copper diffusion.” Krocher does not teach at least these features of the claimed invention. That is, claim 1 is not anticipated by Krocher because Krocher does not specifically name the compounds as recited in claim 1. The Examiner states that Krocher discloses (triethoxysilyl)ethyldiphenylphosphine on page 7 of the Final Office Action. However, this compound is not recited in present claim 1. Furthermore, Krocher is completely silent with

respect to any copper-related properties of any disclosed compounds. Claims 2, 4, 10 and 11 are hereby cancelled. Thus, the rejection of these claims is moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and claim 3, which depends therefrom, are allowable over Krocher and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection.

Claims 1-3 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,726,809 to Allum et al. (hereinafter “Allum”). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over Allum in that the claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, “compound represented by the general formula is selected from the group consisting of: 1-diethylphosphino-2-triethoxysilylethane, 1-dimethylphosphino-2-trimethoxysilylethane, 1-diethylphosphino-2trimethoxysilylethane, 1-diphenylphosphino-2-trimethoxysilylethane, 1-dimethylphosphino-3triethoxysilylpropane, 1-diethylphosphino-3-triethoxysilylpropane, 1-diphenylphosphino-3-triethoxysilylpropane, 1-diphenylphosphino-3-triethoxysilylpropane, 1-diphenylphosphino-2-trichlorosilylethane, 1-diphenylphosphino-2trisdimethylaminosilylethane, 1-diphenylphosphino-2-triisocyanatosilylethane and 1-diphenylphosphino-4-triethoxysilylethylbenzene, wherein the material prevents copper diffusion.” Allum does not teach at least these features of the claimed invention. That is, claim 1 is not anticipated by Allum because Allum does not specifically name the compounds as recited in claim 1. The Examiner states that Allum discloses (trisethoxysilyl)ethyldiphenylphosphine on page 6 of the Final Office Action. However, this compound is not recited in present claim 1. Furthermore, Allum is completely silent with respect to any copper-related properties of any disclosed compounds. Claims 2, 10 and 11 are hereby cancelled. Thus, the rejection of these claims is moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and claim 3, which depends therefrom, are allowable over Allum and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: Mark R. Kresloff
Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant